

Spring 4-15-1998

Senate Meeting, April 15, 1998

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, April 15, 1998" (1998). *Academic Senate Minutes*. Paper 636.
<http://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/636>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA
TIME: 7 P.M., Wednesday, April 15, 1998
PLACE: Circus Room, Bone Student Center

Call to Order

Approval of Minutes of April 1, 1998

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

Executive Session – Honorary Degree Nominations

Committee Reports

Action Items:

1. 03.24.98.01 Amendment to University Constitution Pertaining to Sexual Orientation
2. 02.05.98.01 BA/BS Catalog Description – Academic Affairs

Information Items:

1. 04.07.98.01 Period of Commentary on the President – Administrative Affairs
2. 04.15.98.01 Academic Plan – Academic Affairs

Communications

Discussion

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meeting participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES (Approved)

April 15, 1998

Volume XXIX, No. 13

Call to Order

Chairperson Paul Borg called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m. and stated that we are operating under the Constitution adopted in 1969 as amended through 1996.

Roll Call

Secretary Curt White called the roll and declared a quorum.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion XXIX-141 by Senator Jerich (seconded by Senator Nelsen) to approve the minutes of April 1 1998, in accordance with the ISU Constitution established in 1969.

Correction to the April 1, 1998, minutes by Senator Kurtz on page 8. "Senator Kurtz said in the evaluation of academic department chairpersons *that* faculty input on forms is solicited....."

The motion passed on a voice vote with 4 abstentions.

Chairperson's Remarks

Chairperson Paul Borg said:

- A reminder to students senators to come pick up the Senate packets at the Senate office.
- Received a memo from the Search Committee for the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost search. There is time set aside for Senate Executive Committee and faculty membership for on campus interviews with the 2 candidates:
 - Friday, April 17, 1998, from 8:30 – 9:30 p.m. in Hovey 409 for Dean Goldfarb
 - Thursday, April 23, 1998, from 11:00 – 12:00 noon in Hovey 401 for Dean Schollaert
- I have gone to various departmental meetings in the last week discussing the Constitution events. I am pleased by the response and questions. I have attended 8 faculty meetings of the 20 meetings that are scheduled.
- I had planned to have lists of nominations and vitae for the committees elections that we are supposed to elect at our next Senate meeting. The events of this spring are having an effect on the shared governance system at this University. We need to elect members:
 - 1/3 of the members for the Faculty Ethics and Grievance Committee,
 - 1/3 of the members for the Academic Freedom Committee, and
 - the entire Panel of 10I do not have enough nominations for any of these committees, even to fill the number to be elected. I urge the faculty to talk to your colleagues. So far we have received replies from 13 of the 33 departments.
- I want you to extend individual thanks to Vicki Boyd for her service over the past two years. The promise of employment throughout the summer and a much better paycheck means we are losing her to State Farm Insurance Companies effective April 24, 1998. I publicly want to

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson, Michelle Brook said:

- The panel discussion on April 8, 1998, on shared governance had a good discussion and debate. There were not many people in attendance. We have a communication problem on the University about shared governance. A common theme I got from the panel discussion was that the University needs to build a community again and build up trust between faculty, administrators, and students.
- I will have a student caucus on April 29, 1998, at 6:30 p.m. before the Senate meeting. We will discuss goals for the year. I will answer any questions about the Senate in general.
- There are two passages in the University By-laws I would like you to be aware of:
The absence policies for Senate meetings, pg. 13, Section 3 & 4 and
page 6, Section 2.13 for committee meetings.

Student Government Association President's Remarks

Heather Brown said there was an excellent response on the quad today for the Springfest.

Administrator's Remarks

President Strand said he would like share with the Academic Senate information regarding the Select Committee on Governance. There will be an article in the ISU Report that will list all of the members of the committee. The following charge will be shared with the Select Committee on Governance:

1. Examine the national literature relating to shared governance to assess trends and identify effective models of shared governance.
2. Examine previously completed university studies and reports related to shared governance to ascertain if they contain any information, which may be helpful to the campus at this time.
3. Examine peer institutions to ascertain the types of shared governance models they have in place and how they might be useful on this campus.
4. Define and articulate for the University the needs and roles of all university constituency groups within a shared governance model of operation. (This shared governance model should function within the University Constitution.)
5. Provide an avenue or a forum for interested parties to offer input into the work of the Committee as it addresses its charge.
6. Prepare a written report on shared governance, which is responsive to the above-referenced charge. Submit a draft of the report to the President for his review. Share the final version of the report with the University community and Board of Trustees no later than February 1999.

This will be the work of the committee. The committee has been offered the opportunity to report at the October 1998 or the February 1999 meetings of the BOT. There are certain parallels between this charge and the Ad hoc Committee on shared governance; there are also some differences, but the objectives are similar. I am grateful to the people willing to serve on the committee including the four members of the Academic Senate.

Questions/Comments:

Senator Reid asked why you chose not to have the Senate collaborate in the decision to choose members of the committee and to choose the charge? *Reply* – President Strand said his definitive

instruction was from the Executive Committee to choose from the 10 names submitted. I did not find the action taken by the full Senate, nor the composition of the committee of the Senate to be representative of the University community. **Senator Reid** said the question is why did you not allow them to participate in the choosing of the charge and then the choosing of the members?

Reply – President Strand said because it is a presidentially selected committee. **Senator Reid** said one major difference between the charge of the Senate's Ad hoc Committee and your committee was the charge for the Senate Ad hoc Committee which said that it would look into the present and historical state of shared governance at ISU. Can you explain why this is absent from your charge. **Reply** – President Strand said it is not a portion of the charge committee but the topic is in no way precluded from being explored by the committee. I will discuss this with the committee at the first meeting.

Senator Williams said there is a parenthetical statement referring to the Constitution. I assume this is the Constitution approved by the BOT. **Reply** – President Strand said yes. **Senator Williams** said what if this committee finds that the Constitution is too limiting with regard to shared governance at to the University. What happens then? **Reply** – President Strand said as this committee examines the national literature and what is operational in other universities, it would then have the opportunity to examine this Constitution to find out to what extent it is consistent with the other areas of comparison. If there is a dramatic departure from the current Constitution, this committee would discuss that.

Senator Razaki said that currently the Academic Senate is operating under the 1969 Constitution. It will be difficult to operate under that guideline. If they operate under the BOT Constitution, they will be violating the instructions of the Academic Senate. Will the committee be able to set aside the Constitution adopted by BOT? **Reply** – President Strand said the committee is not operating under either the 1969 or the 1998 Constitution. The committee's operation is separate from any of the Constitutions. The committee will be functioning in the best interest of the University trying to reduce anxiety, minimize concerns, and to help pull the University community back together. **Senator Razaki** asked if this is an independent committee that has the right to come to any conclusions? **Reply** – President Strand said this is a committee appointed by the President that I will be working closely with. The committee will reach its own consensus regarding conclusions, recommendations, etc.

Senator White said that in the original remarks at the Executive meeting you spoke of an action agenda and the creation of protocols. Will the action agenda be a part of the report provided to you and the Board or will the action agenda be created after that report? Are the protocols something you will be working on independently? **Reply** – President Strand said both of those topics would become part of his interaction with the committee. They will be part of the functional definition of the committees work.

Senator Noyes asked if there would be an effort between the existing committee of the Senate and the Presidential Committee to link-up in some way? **Reply** – President Strand said that remains to be seen. It could be potentially redundant when you recognize that 6 people on the committee that I am appointing are also on the Academic Senate appointed committee.

Provost Urice said:

- You will discuss the Academic Plan this evening. I express my appreciation to the Academic Planning Committee, especially to Associate Provost, Dr. Betty Chapman. This document is an important linkage document that brings together the open planning and budgeting processes we have developed. There is a quote often used by people who work the plans from General Eisenhower, "Plans are nothing but planning is everything." This plan does matter. We have used these plans as a roadmap for action, allocation of resources, and for setting direction for this campus.
- I will be at a meeting in Springfield on April 29, 1998, so this will be my last meeting as a member of the Academic Senate. Over the last four year as a member of this body, I have observed select current and past members devote enormous time and energy to the work of the Academic Senate. They have elevated the needs of the University as a whole, especially the students above their own. At my last meeting, I express my personal and professional gratitude to these members of the Academic Senate.

Vice President Boschini said we are in the process of selecting the Student Trustee for the year. We had 8 applications for the position. The committee will begin the interview and deliberation process tonight. Hopefully the Student Trustee will be appointed within 16 days.

Vice President Taylor had no remarks.

Closed Executive Session starts at 7:30 p.m.

Open Session begins at 7:40 p.m.

Committee Reports:

Chairperson Borg said he would like all the committees to meet after the Senate meeting tonight to elect a Chairperson and Secretary for each committee.

Academic Affairs: No report

Administrative Affairs: No report

Budget Committee: No report

Faculty Affairs: No report

Rules Committee: No report

Student Affairs: No report

Action Items:

1) *Amendment to University Constitution Pertaining to Sexual Orientation – Administrative Affairs (03.24.98.01.)* Chairperson Borg said he has provided a copy tonight with the wording as it exists in the present recommendation.

Motion XXIX – 142 by Senator Clark (seconded by Nelsen) to adopt the amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was passed on a voice vote with 40 aye and 5 abstentions.

2) *BA/BS Catalog Description – Academic Affairs (02.05.98.01)* Senator Lockwood said this was tabled on March 18, 1998. At that time I passed out a document and requested input on the item. This evening I passed out a document with several options that were suggested.

Motion XXIX – 143 by Senator Lockwood (seconded by Senator Garner) to move that the BA/BS Catalog Description be approved as written and to include options 1 & 2, but not to include options 3 & 4.

Senator Lockwood said options 1 & 2 clarify the language and indicate that not all Social Sciences would be under the Bachelor of Arts. New language has been introduced. Options 3 & 4 are not in the report. Option 4 seemed inconsistent with the General Education program.

Debate:

Senator Varner commented that the idea of problem solving described in the BS Statement of Purpose ought to be included in the BA description, just like communication skills that are mentioned in both. Reply – Senator Lockwood said the committee has tried to define primary differences.

Senator Zielinski said that option 4 is an explanation of option 3. The two reinforce each other. Reply – Senator Lockwood said that the description does not simply add an additional clarification, but it would require us to re-visit the General Education Program.

Senator Blum said to adopt a parallel sentence structure for the BA. The word “encourages” is a poor choice of words for the statement of purpose. We are supposed to make sure the students do acquire the skills. Reply – Chairperson Borg asked what an appropriate re-placement for the word would be? *Senator Blum* said students pursuing the BA degree “will acquire” as opposed to “be encouraged to.” Reply – Chairperson Borg said we are at the stage of passing this item not writing it.

Senator Clark said the statement of purpose is to encourage students in certain directions. I agree with Senator Lockwood that we should not include options 3 & 4 in the final version.

Chairperson Borg said a word has been suggested to replace encourages and that is “fosters.” The Bachelor of Arts degree *fosters* the acquisition. . . . and the Bachelor of Science degree *fosters* the acquisition. Is that a friendly amendment? Accepted by Senator Lockwood and Senator Garner. Not accepted by Senator Reid. Chairperson Borg said “*Provides for*” is a second suggestion.

Senator Lockwood (seconded by Senator Garner) accepted “*Provides for*” as a friendly amendment for **Motion XXIX – 143**.

Chairperson Borg said the statement of wording for both of these degrees is “The Bachelor of Arts degree *provides for* the acquisition, and the Bachelor of Science degree *provides for*...”

Senator Jerich said regarding the statement of requirements for a 3-hour course in the Bachelor Science degree. He wonders if the requirements for the course are clear. He would like to have the students comment on the wording.

Senator Brown said where is the approved list? *Reply* – Chairperson Borg said when the list has been approved it will be in the catalog. **Senator Brook** said there is no confusion.

Senator White offered a “*friendly amendment*” for wording. “The courses to be selected from an approved list of *courses from* natural sciences, mathematics, statistics and technology.”

Senator Short said that in the first sentence it seems like you need to take one course combining all the areas. In the second sentence it seems like you take one course from any one of these areas. *Reply* – Chairperson Borg said in the first sentences we are talking about what the entire requirements are not individual course requirements. The second sentence is specific to the course.

Senator Brown said she agrees with Senator Short that if you look at the two sentences it does imply that increasing your knowledge *of* natural sciences, mathematics, statistics, and technology as opposed to one of. The way it is stated, I can see the students will get confused.

Senator Hillman said students could be confused because of the *and/or* technology. I do not like the *and/or* wording because it seems you are taking a course between all of the above and then you also have to choose between natural sciences, mathematics, statistics, and/or technology

Chairperson Borg said he will remind the Senate that the caution we were given on March 18, 1998, is now happening again. Changes in wording, except for a few “friendly amendments” are supposed to be amendments that are proposed, need to be in writing and agreed to. Changes in wording are matters for our committee structure to deal with. There was a request on April 1, 1998, for people to read this and bring their suggestions to the committee. That is the appropriate place to discuss the “*and/or*” suggestion. More debates, and this will need to be sent back to the committee without action.

Senator Clark said to move to a vote.

Senator Blum said objected and the debate continued. How do you undo the question and send back to the committee? *Reply* – Chairperson Borg said this has been seconded, we are in debate. Senator Blum said would like to see a larger parallel structure in the statement of requirements.

Chairperson Borg said that matters of policy and questions of changing the policy may be brought up by any member of the Academic community, by communicating directly to the Senate, by communicating to any Senator, by communicating with the appropriate Internal Committee, and requesting that this be looked at. Re-committing to the committee requires a vote by the Senate. You must *move* to commit this item back to the committee. That requires a majority vote.

Motion XXIX – 144 by Senator Blum (seconded by Senator Strickland) to commit this item (XXIX – 143) back to the committee.

Debate:

Senator Nelsen said it should be appropriate to vote on this document this evening. I am against this motion.

Senator Varner said against sending back to the committee.

Senator Kurtz said yields to Senator Clark.

Senator Clark said specific wording for the programs have already been determined. I move the previous question.

Motion XXIX – 145 by Senator Clark (seconded by Senator Razaki) move the previous question.

Chairperson Borg said all in favor of cutting off debate on the **Motion XXIX – 144** (to commit to the committee.)

The motion passed with 28 aye, 3 nay, and 8 abstentions.

Motion XXIX – 144 by Senator Blum (seconded by Senator Strickland) to commit Motion XXIX – 143 back to committee.

The motion did not pass on a roll call vote with 3 aye, 33 nay, and 8 abstentions.

Motion XXIX – 146 by Senator Clark (seconded by Nelsen) to move previous question.

The motion passed on a voice vote of 30 aye, 6 nay, 4 abstentions.

Chairperson Borg said we would move to a vote on the motion.

Motion XXIX – 143 by Senator Lockwood (seconded by Senator Garner) to move that the BA/BS Catalog Description be approved as written and to include options 1 & 2, but not to include options 3 & 4. Add two friendly amendments:

- Under statement of purpose for Bachelor of Arts should read, “The Bachelor of Arts degree *provides for*” and under statement of purpose for Bachelor of Science Degree should read, “The Bachelor of Science degree *provides for*.....”
- The final sentence will read, “The course is to be selected from an approved list of courses from natural sciences, mathematics, statistics, and technology.

The motion passed on a roll call vote of 30 aye, 4 nay, and 9 abstentions.

Information Items:

1) *Period of Commentary on the President – Administrative Affairs (04.17.98.01)* Senator Clark read the proposed statement: “It shall be the annual responsibility of the Administrative Affairs Committee of the Academic Senate to administer a period of commentary (open to all members of the university community) on the job performance of the President. The Committee shall report its findings in summary form to the President, the Executive Session of the Academic Senate and to the Board of Trustees. This summary shall be forwarded by March 1st of each year.” The idea is that there will be an open period of commentary asking anyone to submit comments. The rules are the same as the Administrator Evaluation in relation to “confidentiality” vs “anonymous.” Comments would be submitted to Administrative Affairs. They are responsible for organizing the comments into a report and forwarding to the appropriate groups: the President, the Board of Trustees, and the Executive Committee. Administrative Affairs is obligated to ask for comments.

Questions/Comments:

Senator Walters said as a member of the Administrative Affairs Committee, I want to emphasize that we kept the remarks very short, and the exact procedure to be used from year to year flexible.

Senator Reid asked what would happen if there were many negative letters. Would it be possible for the committee to send out a survey. *Reply* – Clark said yes.

Senator Urice said we had a consultant on the campus from the Executive Search Firm that was working with the committee on the presidential search. Did anyone present this issue to the consultant? *Reply* – Senator Clark said no. *Senator Urice* asked if that would be useful to the committee? *Reply* – Senator Clark said no. We have to look at the perspective of what we need on campus as opposed to what would look good for an external candidate.

Senator Razaki asked how would you handle disseminating the information to the faculty on campus. *Reply* – Senator White said it needs to be treated as a personnel matter, restricted to the committees that are entrusted with personnel matters. The committee feels it is necessary that there be a conduit from the University community, to the President and to the Board, so we lessen the necessity for crisis-oriented actions by the community.

Senator Walters said he feels these comments are not ones that should be for general campus consumption. This evaluation should be for the President, Executive Committee, and the Senate.

Senator Williams asked if this is the same issue as whether the student opinions should be published to let students have opinions of teaching? *Reply* – Senator Clark said that would violate the President’s rights.

Senator Razaki said the campus needs to know.

Senator Garner said that violates the right to privacy.

Senator Clark said the point of presenting this to the Executive Committee in Executive Session is for the purpose of privacy. It is not legal for the evaluation to be generally known.

Senator Campbell asked what would be the outcome of such an approach? What is the benefit of this process to the University as a whole? What will the University gain as a result of this evaluation procedure? *Reply* – Senator White said this is the opportunity for self-assessment for the President and the possibility of conversations about performance. Chairperson Borg said the process for looking at policies for administrator evaluation has been ongoing for almost a year. At the general faculty meeting on November 17, 1997, the second resolution asked the Senate to look into evaluation of the Provost and the President. The purpose was for the campus not always to deal with things in a crisis or at general faculty meeting. **Senator Campbell** said the situation could be there if it was handled professionally. Could there be negative consequences in personnel or University as whole matters? *Reply* – Senator Clark said your question needs to be more specific.

Senator Razaki asked what power does the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate have in terms of personnel matters? I see no reason that the Executive Committee should be involved. It should go through the President and BOT. *Reply* – Senator Walters said it is not proper for any of the committees to address the body outside the Senate without the knowledge of the Executive Committee. This was developed as improved mechanisms for the whole administrator process. This should be seen as an improvement in administrator evaluation, rather than a device for communicating to the campus on campus-wide feelings.

Senator Brown said how appropriate is this in relationship to negative consequences? *Reply* – Senator Clark said it is illegal to release general personnel information to the University.

Senator Urice asked if there would be any cost to the committee or to the desired outcome to delay moving this to the action stage until such time as a member or members of the Academic Senate met with the Executive Search Consultant and shared the plans with him? *Reply* – Senator Clark said he would be happy to contact him.

2) *Academic Plan – Academic Affairs*. Chairperson Borg said the Academic Planning Committee consists of 8 members. Four faculty members from the Senate, the current and past chair of the Senate, current and past chair of Academic Affairs Committee, and Provost or designee, Associate Vice Presidents of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, and the Student Trustee. Dr. Betty Chapman is here to discuss the Academic plan.

Chairperson Borg said this goes off campus. It is presented as an item to the Board of Trustees. Ultimately the Board of Higher Education asks for the report. This is a required report from the University. The process has worked very well for many years. In the last two years it has become a part in the overall planning at the University.

Questions/Comments:

Senator White asked what the difference is between this document and the document at Milner Library? *Reply* – Dr. Betty Chapman said the documents at Milner include the full program reviews with the faculty vitas. Here, we try to restrict the narrative to somewhere around 20 pages.

Senator White said that some of the old categories in the program reviews are different from section to section. Some have recommendations and some don't. Is there anything to be made of that? *Reply* – Dr. Betty Chapman said no. *Senator White* said he is troubled by the differences in productivity. In some sections in productivity there is a lot of specificity about scholarly productivity and in others there is very little. Would I find more specificity if I went and looked at the documents? *Reply* – Dr. Betty Chapman said programs are requested to provide documentation. *Senator White* asked if we are still being “careful” about these in terms of public dissemination? *Reply* – Dr. Betty Chapman said the institution has taken a more aggressive stance on its own program analysis. Academic Planning Committee did not review one of the 17 programs up for review this year because it was disestablished. We have developed a certain amount of credibility off campus. *Senator White* said he is unsure of the role of the Senate. For the accountability to be there, there needs to be a good deal of specificity. Why is this document coming to the Senate and what will I learn from it? *Reply* – Chairperson Borg said we took seriously the comments you made last year in dealing with this. We require one additional person for the academic plan and welcome your volunteering to be nominated.

Senator Otsuka asked if the decreasing enrollments in the Business Programs are due to the changes in decreasing enrollments at ISU? *Reply* – Chairperson Borg said no, the Planning Committee was provided with information across the nation. This is a national trend in Business programs.

Senator Clark asked how do we define a college objective from a university-wide objective for improvements? *Reply* – Dr. Betty Chapman said the process by which the goals and priorities are established are reviewed by a broad base of constituents that transcends each college. These include the Academic Planning Committee, Provost Advisory Committee, Vice Presidents, and other parties that have specific interests. They are invited to go through a couple of revisions on the period from November to February. The Academic Planning Committee does not change College's objectives. With respect to the renovation of Felmley Hall, the reason they are described as a CAS objective is probably because they were there before and need to be somewhere – even though CAS is not the only College involved. This is the second year of a multi-year project.

Dr. Betty Chapman gave a special thanks to the committee of this year. They did a particularly good job and I was very gratified to work with Paul Borg, Jan Neuleib, Wayne Lockwood, Jan Cook, Dean Dillingham, and Dean Little.

Communication:

President Strand said thank you to the members of the Academic Senate regarding their deliberations in the executive session.

Adjournment:

Motion XXIX – 147 to adjourn at 9:05 p.m. by Senator VanVooren (seconded by Senator Lockwood.) The motion carried unanimously on a standing vote.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Senators
FROM: Wayne N. Lockwood, Jr., Chair
Academic Affairs Committee
RE: Changes in BA and BS Degree Descriptions
DATE: April 15, 1998

UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AT ISU

Undergraduate degrees available at Illinois State University include the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Science in Education, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Music, and Bachelor of Music education degrees. When applying for graduation, the student indicates the specific degree which he or she is qualified to receive. Other requirements are specified for each degree below.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR THE BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE

The Bachelor of Arts degree ^{promotes for} encourages the acquisition of written and oral communication skills, *abilities in the critical analyses of texts, the understanding of cultures, and a working knowledge of social, political, and historical contexts. The degree is typically pursued by those students whose academic emphasis in their major area of study is directed toward the **humanistic and social sciences disciplines.

*Option 1: ...creative thinking , abilities...

**Option 2. ...humanities, arts, and selected areas of the social sciences."

STATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE

Students pursuing the Bachelor of Arts degree will acquire knowledge of a foreign language as demonstrated by successful completion of FOR 115 (or the equivalent)***

***Option 3. ...and an additional 6 hours of humanities courses drawn from the current General Education Program course categories emphasizing humanities.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FOR THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE

The Bachelor of Science degree encourages the acquisition of oral and written communication skills and the acquisition of analytical skills for examining and solving problems. The degree is typically pursued by those students whose academic emphasis in their major area of study is directed towards the natural sciences, mathematics, statistics or a technological field.

STATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE DEGREE

Students pursuing the Bachelor of Science degree will acquire increased knowledge of the natural sciences, mathematics, statistics, and/or technology as demonstrated by the successful completion of a three-hour course, beyond those required for General Education. The course is to be selected from an approved list of natural sciences, mathematics, statistics, and technology courses.

NOTE: Copy for other degrees follows existing catalog descriptions.

Courses from file

Option 4. * FOR 115 substitutes for Quantitative Reasoning in the Middle Core, and one Humanities course substitutes for 3 hours of Math/Science/Technology in the Outer Core, and one additional Humanities course drawn from either the Middle or Outer Core. This directly parallels similar addition to the BS degree.